DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 172 UD 023 704

AUTHOR Tobias, Robert; And Others
TITLE Project ESL-SEDAC. O.E.E. Annual Evaluation Report, E.S.E.A. Title VII. 1982-83.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 28p.; Prepared by the O.E.E./Special Education Evaluation Unit.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Career Education; Curriculum Development; *Daily Living Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Special Education; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

During 1982-83, the first of three projected program cycles, the Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Developmental Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) provided direct instruction to 246 handicapped limited English proficient students in schools throughout New York City. Resource assistance, staff development, and parent training activities were also part of the program. Despite some delays in implementation, the project was initiated successfully, and all program objectives were fully or partially attained. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English language listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and responses on participant questionnaires indicated that the staff development workshops were effective and well received. The program also made progress toward full attainment of its parent involvement objective. Finally, the program compiled and field-tested a comprehensive curriculum, "Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide," which will be printed and ready for distribution early in the 1983-84 cycle. The following recommendations are offered for continued program effectiveness: (1) continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers; and (2) consider conducting an assessment of training needs of staff, depending on their prior training, experience, and the language backgrounds of their students. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246172

PROJECT ESL-SEDAC

1982-83

OEE Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. K. Minter
NYC Bd of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD023704

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

E.S.E.A. TITLE VII

PROJECT ESL-SEDAC

1982-83

Division of Special Education
Edward Sermier, Chief Administrator

D.S.E. Reimbursable Programs
Allison Tupper

Raul Lahee, Project Coordinator

Prepared by:

O.E.E./Special Education Evaluation Unit

Robert Tobias, Evaluation Manager
Christine Halfar, Evaluation Specialist
Jerome Margolis, Evaluation Specialist
Deborah Allen, Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Evaluation
Richard Guttenberg, Director

ED023704

A SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

During 1982-83, the first of three projected program cycles, the Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Developmental Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) provided direct instruction to 246 handicapped L.E.P. students, as well as resource assistance, staff development, and parent training. Despite some delays in implementation the project was successfully initiated and all program objectives were fully or partially attained.

The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and responses on participant questionnaires indicated that the staff development workshops were effective and well-received. The program also made progress toward full attainment of its parent involvement objective during the upcoming program cycle. Finally, the program compiled and field-tested a comprehensive curriculum, Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide, which will be printed and ready for distribution early in the 1983-84 cycle.

The following recommendations are offered for continued program effectiveness:

- continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers;
- consider conducting an assessment of training needs of staff, depending on their prior training, experience, and the language backgrounds of their students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	3
	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY	3
	FINDINGS	4
	Level of Implementation	4
	Direct Instruction and Resource Services	4
	Curriculum Development	5
	Staff Development	6
	Parent Education and Involvement	7
III.	EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	8
	DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION	8
	PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES	8
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	9
	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	9
	Participants' Knowledge of Workshop Topics	11
	Participants' Evaluation of Workshops	12
	Differences Among Participants	19
	CURRICULUM	20
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1

Frequency Distributions of Student Mastery in Four Areas of E.S.L. Instruction 10

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop I. 13

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop II 14

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop III 15

Table 5

Mean Pre- and Post-Session Self-Reports of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshops, by Type of Participant 16

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Participants Giving High Ratings on Four Dimensions of Workshop Presentation 17

Table 7

Mean Ratings on Four Dimensions of Workshop Presentation, by Type of Participant. 18

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the authors listed on the title page, a number of other people contributed to this evaluation effort. Chief among these were Georgeann DiSomma who coordinated the data processing, and Shelia Moore who was responsible for typing the final document, as well as its several drafts.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the evaluation of the 1982-83 Title VII English as a Second Language, Special Education Developmental Approach Curriculum Project (ESL-SEDAC) of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Public Schools. This program, which has a projected three-year cycle, was designed to provide supplementary instruction, resource services, staff development, and parent education to support the basic special education program for handicapped students with limited English proficiency (L.E.P.) throughout the New York City public schools. A central program goal was the preparation of a developmental, language-based E.S.L. curriculum which focuses on daily living skills to promote growth in English proficiency.

Results of a 1981 D.S.E. survey showed that there were more than 10,000 handicapped Spanish-dominant L.E.P. students who were in need of E.S.L. and subject-matter instruction. In addition, D.S.E. served at least 500 Indo-Chinese- and French-Creole-language-dominant students with similar needs. The ESL-SEDAC program was designed to help meet the educational needs of these students as mandated in the Lau Regulations and the Aspira Decision.

The program was evaluated by the Office of Educational Evaluation (O.E.E.) through the collection and analysis of pupil achievement data and staff development questionnaires, and the results of interviews with project staff and observations of classes served by the program.

All data were recorded on O.E.E.-developed forms. The evaluation addressed the following issues:

- To what extent was the program implemented as proposed?
- Did the program meet its objectives in the areas of student achievement, staff training, curriculum development, and parent training?

The following chapters present the findings of the evaluation. Chapter II provides a description of the program and the assessment of program implementation; Chapter III addresses the level of attainment of program objectives; and Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY

ESL-SEDAC supplemented the basic special education program for handicapped L.E.P. students by providing direct pupil instruction, resource services, staff development, and parent education. The target population were L.E.P. students who were two or more years below grade level in reading or math, had never been served by other Title VII programs, and had scored below the twentieth percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). Program participants, who spoke Spanish, Haitian-Creole, or Indo-Chinese, included learning disabled, emotionally handicapped, educable mentally retarded, hearing impaired, and neurologically impaired and emotionally handicapped students; they were referred to the program by school-based support teams. The basic special education program was provided in self-contained classes staffed by tax-levy teachers in the ratio of one teacher to 12 students.

Pupil-centered objectives of the program called for student gains in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Other program objectives were to promote parent involvement, improve instructional skills of participating classroom teachers, and, the central program goal, to develop an E.S.L. curriculum based in daily living activities.

An O.E.E. consultant visited six program sites to observe instruction, document student records, and interview classroom teachers of participating students, as well as program staff. In addition, the consultant observed three staff-development workshops offered by ESL-SEDAC project

staff for both participating and non-participating special education classroom teachers. The following sections present the findings from the interviews and observations.

FINDINGS

Level of Implementation

During 1982-83, ESL-SEDAC served 246 students at 22 public schools located in the Bronx, Manhattan, and Brooklyn, and at the Lexington School for the Deaf, a non-public school serving students with communication impairment.

Staff included the program coordinator, who coordinated and supervised the overall organization and implementation of the program, including fiscal management; two resource teachers who visited tax-levy classroom teachers to provide resource materials and demonstration lessons, and to assist in E.S.L. instructional strategies, materials development, and promoting parent involvement; and two educational assistants who assisted in materials distribution and individual and small-group E.S.L. instruction.

Despite a brief period of service in the Fall, 1982, the program was not fully implemented until Spring, 1983. The current program coordinator was hired in February and the two resource teachers were hired in March and April. One educational assistant was hired in October by the original coordinator and the second was hired in April.

Direct Instruction and Resource Services

A primary component of the ESL-SEDAC project was direct pupil instruction in the areas of daily living skills and career education, with the goal of

improving students' abilities in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The weekly sessions were conducted by the resource teachers in English, with reinforcement activities in the child's dominant language, which was either Spanish, Haitian-Creole, or Indo-Chinese. Spanish-speaking students, who made up the large majority of program participants, received instruction as a whole class; they attended bilingual special education classes for their basic educational program. The Haitian-Creole- and Indo-Chinese- speaking students, who, for the most part, were in monolingual special education classes, generally received some whole-class instruction with their classmates followed by individualized small-group instruction. The project staff reported that they planned their instructional sessions based on the students' individual educational plans (I.E.P.s) which were maintained by the special education classroom teachers, and that they assessed student progress informally based on student responses.

In addition to demonstration lessons and consultations with classroom teachers, program resource services also included the provision of instructional materials including various texts, posters, games, and consumable supplies. Resource materials were distributed through the classroom teachers of students served as a whole class and given directly to students receiving pull-out instruction. Among the materials that were viewed as most effective by project staff and classroom teachers were English Across the Curriculum, Book I; Discover America, N.Y.; the "Moods and Emotions" poster series; and the Bell and Howell Language Master.

Curriculum Development

The major resource activity was the preparation of Day by Day in English:

An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide which was compiled during the current cycle. According to the program coordinator it will be printed and ready for distribution at the beginning of the second program cycle.

Day by Day in English is organized around specific daily living themes which form the basis for comprehensive instructional units containing vocabulary, sample lesson plans, and a range of activities for students at different levels of English-language proficiency. The curriculum contains a total of eight resource units: the home; the school; community, communication, and travel; clothing and seasons; shopping and food; health, hygiene, and safety; recreation; and jobs and careers.

Staff Development

The program provided three staff development workshops, each of which was presented at four regional offices; the workshops were planned by the ESL-SEDAC project coordinator and implemented by the project staff and outside consultants. Special education classroom teachers participating in the ESL-SEDAC project, as well as those not currently participating, attended the sessions. Each of the workshop participants received a stipend for attending the training sessions, paid on a per-session basis.

The first workshop provided an overview of the project and an analysis of the three cultures--Hispanic, Haitian-Creole, and Indo-Chinese--served by the project. This analysis consisted of a profile of cultural and familial patterns, communication and learning styles, and suggestions for appropriate teacher-pupil interactions. The second workshop offered general E.S.L. techniques and instructional grouping strategies, and the third

workshop offered specific E.S.L. strategies for teaching daily living skills, ideas for teacher-made materials, a review of commercially-prepared materials, and an opportunity for teachers to experience a "hands-on" approach to curriculum implementation. A question and answer period followed each session and participants completed questionnaires assessing the workshops' impact. (See Chapter III.)

O.E.E. observed all three workshops and found them to be well-organized, informative, and well-attended; in all, over 100 participants attended each workshop. Participants appeared to be responsive and enthusiastic about all of the sessions; staff who were interviewed found the two workshops offering specific instructional strategies particularly useful.

Parent Education and Involvement

Because of the project's delayed start, staff were not able to implement the parent involvement component as fully as had been intended. However, three parent education meetings were held, two for Spanish-speaking parents and one for Haitian-Creole-speaking parents. At those meetings, the project coordinator discussed the rationale of the project and its proposed curriculum. In addition, he offered suggestions for the parents to assist their children with follow-up activities at home.

III. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program was designed to attain seven objectives. Four of these concerned pupil achievement, one concerned parent participation, one involved mastery of teaching skills in response to staff development, and the last involved the development of a program curriculum. The following sections present the objectives, the methods of evaluation, and the findings, preceded by a description of the student population.

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

Program staff reported demographic and achievement data for 246 students on O.E.E.-designed data retrieval forms. Participating students ranged in age from six to 18 years; mean age was about 10 years (S.D. = 2.5). Over 80 percent of the students attended elementary schools; the others were in intermediate and junior high schools. Two-thirds were in Health Conservation 30 classes for learning disabled students and the rest were divided among the following programs: resource room; educable mentally retarded; emotionally handicapped; hearing impaired; and neurologically impaired and emotionally handicapped. The primary language of most students (78 percent) was Spanish, 15 percent spoke Indo-Chinese, and seven percent spoke Haitian-Creole.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Four pupil achievement objectives were proposed which called for student mastery in the areas of English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each objective called for mastery by June, 1983 of at least one new skill by 80 percent of the participants; the specific

skills for each student were drawn from the individual educational plan (I.E.P.).

To determine whether the objective was achieved, frequency distributions of student mastery in each of the four areas were prepared. These data, which are presented in Table 1, indicated that the criterion of 80 percent was exceeded for all four areas. Over 93 percent of the students mastered at least one new skill in English-language listening skills, nearly 90 percent mastered speaking skills, about 93 percent mastered reading skills, and over 87 percent mastered writing skills. Accordingly, the four pupil achievement objectives were attained.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parent involvement objective called for participation by 50 percent of the parents of program students in at least two activities, including workshops, individual conferences, I.E.P. conferences, and open school night, by June, 1983. However, because of program delays, the implementation of the parent involvement component was rather limited during the current cycle. Project staff held three introductory parent workshops and began to compile information from the schools in order to be able to contact parents directly during the next cycle. Accordingly, although the parent involvement component was initiated, it was not possible to determine whether the objective was attained.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The staff development objective stated that by June, 1983, 80 percent of the participating teachers would demonstrate mastery of five teaching skills developed in staff training sessions. Mastery was assessed through

Table 1

Frequency Distributions of Student Mastery in Four Areas of E.S.L. Instruction

Number of Skills Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Population	Cumulative Percent
	Listening Skills		
4 or more	93	37.8	37.8
3	44	17.9	55.7
2	57	23.2	78.9
1	35	14.2	93.1
0	17	6.9	100.0
	246		
	Speaking Skills		
4 or more	81	32.9	32.9
3	43	17.5	50.4
2	51	20.7	71.1
1	46	18.7	89.8
0	25	10.2	100.0
	246		
	Reading Skills		
4 or more	77	31.3	31.3
3	33	13.4	44.7
2	48	19.5	64.2
1	71	28.9	93.1
0	17	6.9	100.0
	246		
	Writing Skills		
4 or more	71	28.9	28.9
3	41	16.7	45.6
2	64	26.0	71.6
1	39	15.9	87.5
0	31	12.6	100.1[a]
	246		

[a]Exceeds 100 percent because of rounding.

- The criterion of mastery of at least one skill by 80 percent of the participants was exceeded in all four subject areas. Accordingly, the objective was attained.

a procedure developed jointly by program staff and O.E.E.

Three staff development workshops were prepared, each of which was presented four times. The first, which was attended by a total of 138 bilingual and monolingual special education teachers and other staff, presented the goals and rationale of the program and described the three cultural groups served. The second, which had 122 participants, involved E.S.L. techniques and instructional grouping strategies. The third workshop, attended by 115 staff, presented strategies and materials for activities of daily living instruction for L.E.P. handicapped students. Participants completed questionnaires indicating their pre- and post-session knowledge of the topics presented; level of knowledge ranged from "none" to "full" and was indicated on a seven-point continuum. Participants also noted, on a one-to-seven scale, their evaluation of the workshops' organization, the clarity of objectives, the benefit derived, and the overall quality of the workshop. A total of 50 participants at the first workshop completed questionnaires, for a response rate of 36 percent; at the second 80 did so (66 percent) and at the third 89 (77 percent).

Participant Knowledge of Workshop Topics

In order to determine whether the objective of mastery of five skills was achieved, the participants' post-session responses were examined; mastery was defined by a reported level of knowledge falling at least mid-way between "none" and "full", or on the seven-point scale, a score of four or above. Each of the three workshops presented information on three topics, for a total of nine topics.

Results indicated that seven of the nine workshop topics were mastered

by at least 80 percent of the participants; six of these topics were mastered by at least 90 percent. (See Tables 2, 3 and4.) Because the participants were not identified, it was not possible to assess an individual's mastery across all three workshops and, thus, the proposed criterion of five skills could not be tested. However, given the data which were obtained, it is highly likely that the criterion of mastery of five topics by at least 80 percent of the participating teachers would be achieved. Accordingly, the objective was met.

Average pre-session responses ranged from 2.9, or about one scale point below the halfway mark, to 4.2, or slightly above the halfway mark between "none" and "full" knowledge. Average post-session responses ranged from 4.3 to 5.8; most were between 5.0 and 6.0, or about one point below "full" knowledge. (See Table 5.)

Participants' Evaluation of Workshops

Participants' ratings of the presentation of the workshops indicated that, for the most part, they were well-received. Each workshop was rated on four dimensions: organization; clarity of objectives; amount of benefit; and overall quality. Ratings were made on a seven-point scale.

Results, which are presented in Table 6, indicated that for the first workshop, which was on program goals and the target cultures, and for the third workshop, which was on daily living skills instruction, three-fourths or more of the participants gave the highest or next-to-highest ratings on all dimensions; however, only about half the participants at the second workshop on E.S.L. instruction gave it high ratings. Average ratings, which are presented in Table 7, ranged from about 5.4 for the second workshop to about 6.2 for the first and third workshops.

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports
of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop I

Response[a]	Number of Participants	Percent of Population	Cumulative Percent
	Topic: Goals of the ESL-SEDAC Program		
7	14	28.6	28.6
6	22	44.9	73.5
5	4	8.2	81.7
4	6	12.2	93.9
1-3	3	6.1	100.0
	49		
	Topic: Three Target Cultures Served by the Program		
7	19	38.8	38.8
6	14	28.6	67.4
5	6	12.2	79.6
4	6	12.2	91.8
1-3	4	8.2	100.0
	49		
	Topic: Differences Among the Three Target Cultures		
7	18	36.7	36.7
6	18	36.7	73.4
5	2	4.1	77.5
4	6	12.2	89.7
1-3	5	10.2	99.9[b]
	49		

[a]Level of knowledge was reported on a seven-point scale ranging from "none" to "full".

[b]Does not total 100 percent because of rounding.

- All three topics at the first workshop were mastered by over 80 percent of the participants, as indicated by post-session responses of four or higher.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports
of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop II

Response[a]	Number[b] of Participants	Percent of Population	Cumulative Percent
	Topic: E.S.L. Instructional Methodology		
7	6	7.5	7.5
6	18	22.5	30.0
5	23	28.8	58.8
4	20	25.0	83.8
1-3	13	16.3	100.1[c]
	80		
	Topic: Culturally-specific Instructional Techniques		
7	9	11.3	11.3
6	21	26.3	37.6
5	16	20.0	57.6
4	16	20.0	77.6
1-3	17	21.3	99.9[c]
	80		
	Topic: Instructional Grouping of L.E.P. Students		
7	6	7.6	7.6
6	13	16.5	24.1
5	18	22.8	46.9
4	15	19.0	65.9
1-3	27	34.2	100.1[c]
	79		

[a]Level of knowledge was reported on a seven-point scale ranging from "none" to "full".

[b]Totals are not equal because of missing data.

[c]Does not total 100 percent because of rounding.

- Only one topic at the second workshop was mastered by over 80 percent of the participants, as indicated by post-session responses of four or higher.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Post-Session Self-Reports
of Knowledge of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshop III

Response[a]	Number[b] of Participants	Percent of Population	Cumulative Percent
Topic: Instruction of Daily Living Skills for L.E.P. Students			
7	24	27.3	27.3
6	27	30.7	58.0
5	17	19.3	77.3
4	11	12.5	89.8
1-3	9	10.2	100.0
	88		
Topic: Methods for Developing Teacher-Made Instructional Materials			
7	26	29.5	29.5
6	32	36.4	65.9
5	15	17.0	82.9
4	8	9.1	92.0
1-3	7	8.0	100.0
	88		
Topic: Ability to Independently Produce Teacher-Made Materials			
7	29	32.6	32.6
6	31	34.8	67.4
5	12	13.5	80.9
4	9	10.1	91.0
1-3	8	9.0	100.0
	89		

[a]Level of knowledge was reported on a seven-point scale, ranging from "none" to "full".

[b]Totals are not equal because of missing data.

- All three topics at the third workshop were mastered by over 80 percent of the participants, as indicated by post-session responses of four or higher.

Table 5

Mean Pre- and Post-Session Self-Reports of Knowledge[a] of Topics Presented at Staff Development Workshops, by Type of Participant

Topic		Bilingual Teachers	Monolingual Teachers	All Participants[b]
Workshop I: Program Goals and Target Cultures				
		(N=35)	(N=12)	(N=50)
•Program Goals	Pre	3.1	2.1	3.0
	Post	5.9	5.4	5.8
•Target Cultures	Pre	3.1	3.4	3.5
	Post	5.9	5.0	5.6
•Differences Among Cultures	Pre	3.2	3.0	3.2
	Post	5.9	5.0	5.7
Workshop II: E.S.L. Instruction				
		(N=26)	(N=42)	(N=80)
•E.S.L. Methodolgy	Pre	4.5	2.9	3.4
	Post	5.4	4.4	4.8
•Culturally-Specific Instruction	Pre	3.8	2.5	2.9
	Post	5.5	4.5	4.8
•Instructional Grouping	Pre	4.3	2.3	3.1
	Post	5.2	3.6	4.3
Workshop III: Daily Living Skills Instruction and Materials				
		(N=32)	(N=47)	(N=89)
•Daily Living Skills Instruction	Pre	4.8	3.8	4.2
	Post	6.0	5.1	5.5
•Methods for Teacher-Made Materials	Pre	4.5	3.5	3.9
	Post	6.2	5.3	5.7
•Produce Teacher-Made Materials	Pre	4.7	3.7	4.2
	Post	6.3	5.4	5.7

[a]Level of knowledge was reported on a seven-point scale ranging from "none" to "full".

[b]Total number of participants exceeds the sum of the two teacher groups because of other participants.

- Average pre-session responses for all participants ranged from 2.9 to 4.2; average post-session responses ranged from 4.3 to 5.8. With one exception the bilingual teachers gave higher pre- and post-session reports of their knowledge of workshop topics than monolingual teachers.

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Participants Giving High Ratings[a] on Four Dimensions of Workshop Presentation

Dimension	Workshop I (N=50)		Workshop II (N=80)		Workshop III (N=89)	
	Number	(Percent)	Number	(Percent)	Number	(Percent)
Organization	43	(86)	46	(58)	70	(79)
Clarity of Objectives	39	(78)	44	(55)	75	(84)
Amount of Benefit	43	(86)	35	(44)	67	(75)
Overall Quality	41	(82)	36	(45)	72	(81)

[a]A high rating was defined as "six" or "seven" on a seven-point scale.

- Over three-fourths of the participants at the first and third workshops gave high ratings on all dimensions of workshop presentation; only about half the participants at the second workshop did so.

Table 7

Mean Ratings[a] on Four Dimensions of Workshop Presentation, by Type of Participant

Dimension	Bilingual Teachers	Monolingual Teachers	All Participants[b]
Workshop I: Program Goals and Target Cultures			
	(N=35)	(N=12)	(N=50)
Organization	6.3	5.9	6.2
Clarity	6.2	5.9	6.1
Benefit	6.4	6.2	6.3
Quality	6.3	5.9	6.2
Mean	6.3	6.0	6.2
Workshop II: E.S.L. Instruction			
	(N=26)	(N=42)	(N=80)
Organization	6.1	5.3	5.5
Clarity	6.2	5.0	5.4
Benefit	5.8	4.9	5.2
Quality	6.1	5.0	5.3
Mean	6.1	5.1	5.4
Workshop III: Daily Living Skills Instruction and Materials			
	(N=32)	(N=47)	(N=89)
Organization	6.7	5.8	6.1
Clarity	6.8	6.1	6.3
Benefit	6.6	5.7	6.0
Quality	6.7	5.9	6.2
Mean	6.7	5.9	6.2

[a]Ratings were made on seven-point scale.

[b]Total number of participants exceeds the sum of the two teacher groups because of other participants.

- Average ratings on the four dimension of workshop presentation ranged from about 5.4 for the second workshop to about 6.2 for the first and third.
- Bilingual teachers gave consistently higher ratings of the presentations than did monolingual teachers.

Differences Among Participants

Analysis of these data by type of participant suggested differences in the impact of the training, depending on whether the participants were bilingual or monolingual special education teachers; these two groups made up the large majority of participants. For all three workshops, responses to all questionnaire items tended to be somewhat higher for the bilingual group. (See Tables 5 and 7.) The bilingual teachers indicated higher self-reports of pre-session and post-session knowledge of the workshop topics and also gave consistently higher ratings on the workshops' organization, clarity, usefulness, and overall quality.

These differences were most striking for the second and third workshops; the mean bilingual teachers' response on all items was about one point or more higher than that of the monolingual teachers. At the first workshop, differences between the two groups were half a point or less and on one topic the difference was reversed. Presumably, because of their training and experience, the bilingual teachers as a group had more previous exposure than the monolingual teachers to the issues and information presented. This would particularly be the case for the second and third workshops which were concerned with instruction of L.E.P. students.

Another indication that the two groups may have had different training needs was found in the comments of a number of monolingual participants who made recommendations similar to the following teacher's: "Next time the workshop should be geared toward teaching a regular special education class that has one or two L.E.P. students."

CURRICULUM

The curriculum objective stated that by June, 1983 needs would be assessed, raw data compiled, and field testing begun on the program curriculm, Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide. According to the program coordinator, the needs assessment was carried out, lessons were field-tested, and the curriculum was compiled and sent for printing; distribution and further field-testing will occur during the second program cycle. Accordingly, the objective was met.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analyses of data from pupil achievement records, program interviews and observations, and staff development questionnaires indicated that, despite some delays in progam implementation, the ESL-SEDAC project was successfully initiated. The program, which supplemented the basic special education services of 246 handicapped L.E.P. students, provided direct pupil instruction, resource assistance, staff development, and parent training.

In 1982-83, the first of three program cycles, all program objectives were fully or partially attained. The proposed criteria for student achievement were met in English-language listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and responses on participant questionnaires indicated that the staff development workshops were effective and well-received. The program also made progress toward full attainment of its parent involvement objective during the upcoming program cycle. Finally, the program compiled and field-tested a comprehensive curriculum, Day by Day in English: An ESL-SEDAC Daily Living Skills Curriculum Guide, which will be printed and ready for distribution early in the 1983-84 cycle.

The following recommendations are offered for continued program effectiveness:

- continue to provide services to students, parents, and classroom teachers;
- consider conducting an assessment of training needs of staff, depending on their prior training, experience, and the language backgrounds of their students.